Implementation Year 3: Grades 9-10 Language Arts Teachers¹

Student Academic Progress

Student Academic Progress Data	Category	Point Value	School/Classroom Level Data ²	Point Value	Point Determination
40 Points (33% of total)	Achievement	12	Grade 10: Percent Passing AIMS Reading	4	Percent Passing AIMS Reading 4 points: ≥90% of students passed AIMS Reading 3 points: 70%-89% of students passed AIMS Reading 2 points: 50%-69% of students passed AIMS Reading 0 points: <50% of students passed AIMS Reading
			Grade 9: Percent At or Above the 4 th Stanine on the Stanford 10 Language		Percent At or Above the 4 th Stanine on the Stanford 10 Language 4 points: ≥ 90% of students were at or above 4th Stanine 3 points: 70%-89% % of students were at or above 4th Stanine 2 points: 50%-69% % of students were at or above 4th Stanine 0 points: <50% % of students were at or above 4th Stanine
			SLO Achievement Statement(s)	8	8 points: ≥ 90% of the students met the SLO 6 points: 80%-89% of the students met the SLO 4 points: 60%-79% of the students met the SLO 2 points: <60% of the students met the SLO
	Growth	24	Grade 10: Classroom Median of SGP Reading	12	Median Student Growth Percentile Reading 12 points: Classroom median ≥59 9 points: Classroom median between 48-58 6 points: Classroom median between 37-47 3 points: Classroom median between 26-36 0 points: Classroom median <26
			Grade 9: Classroom Median of Percentile Rank on Stanford 10 Language		Percentile Rank on Stanford 10 Language 12 points: Classroom median ≥59 9 points: Classroom median between 48-58 6 points: Classroom median between 37-47 3 points: Classroom median between26-36 0 points: Classroom median <26
			SLO Growth Statement(s)	12	12 points: ≥ 90% of the students met the SLO 9 points: 80%-89% of the students met the SLO 6 points: 60%-79% of the students met the SLO 3 points: <60% of the students met the SLO
	College and Career Ready	4	Graduation Rate	4	4 points: 4 year graduation rate ≥75% 0 points: 4 year graduation rate <75%

Teaching Performance

Teaching Performance	Domain	Point Value	Leadership Standards	Point Value	Point Determination
		18	1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	3	
	Planning and preparation		1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	3	3 points: Distinguished 2 points: Proficient 1 point: Basic 0 points: Unsatisfactory
			1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	3	
			1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	3	
			1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	3	
			1f. Designing Student Assessments	3	
		15	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3	
	The Classroom Environment		2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning	3	
			2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3	
			2d. Managing Student Behavior	3	
			2e. Organizing Physical Space	3	
60 Points	Instruction	15	3a. Communicating With Students	3	
(50% of total)			3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	3	
			3c. Engaging Students in Learning	3	
			3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	3	
			3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	3	
	Professional Responsibilities	12	4a. Reflecting on Teaching	3 (*.67)	
			4b. Maintaining Accurate Records	3 (*.67)	
			4c. Communicating With Families	3 (*.67)	
			4d. Participating in a Professional Community	3 (*.67)	
			4e. Growing and Developing Professionally	3 (*.67)	
			4f. Showing Professionalism	3 (*.67)	

Data Table ID: 2006 (Version 11.0)

Surveys					
Survey	Category	Point Value	Survey Source	Point Value	Point Determination
20 Points (17% of total)	Survey	20	Student Survey	15	15 points: 79% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 10 points: 55%-78% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 5 points: 31%-54% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above 0 points: <31% of student survey mean scores were a 3 or above
			Parent Survey (School level)	2	2 points: ≥78% of the parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 1 point: 41%-77% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above 0 points: <41% of parent survey mean scores were a 3 or above
			Self-Review	1	1 point: Teacher completed self-review 0 points: Teacher did not complete self-review
			Peer Review	2	2 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was a 3 or above 1 point: the average of the peer review mean scores was 2-2.99 0 points: the average of the peer review mean scores was < 2

Summative Score of the Three Components			
Point Value	Point Determination		
120	120-108 points: Highly Effective 107-85 points: Effective 84-60 points: Developing <60 points: Ineffective		
2	Bonus Points ³		

Note: 1.The information being provided in the rating table is part of a teacher evaluation system and has not yet been validated. ADE recommends that LEAs do not wholly rely on the information provided in these tables when designating summative teacher classifications as part of the evaluation process, without piloting the rating system first.

^{2.} Data are aggregated for each teacher. If a teacher has multiple classrooms or grades, data from those classrooms are combined for the aggregation.

^{3.} In order to encourage more inclusive and collaborative practices within general education settings, special education and general education teachers who collaborate to close the achievement gap between the students with IEPs and general education students will receive 2 bonus points in the final calculation.